Fire, Fuels, and Related Vegetation

Management Direction Plan Amendment

and Environmental Impact Statement

November 2004

DRAFT

Prepared By:
U.S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Upper Snake River District
1405 Hollipark Drive
Idaho Falls, ID 83401

Draft Fire, Fuels and Related Vegetation Management Direction
Plan Amendment and Environmental Impact Statement

October 2004

Dear Reader:

Enclosed for your review and comment is a summary of the **Draft** *Fire, Fuels and Related Vegetation Management Direction Plan Amendment and Environmental Impact Statement* (DEIS). This summary contains information about activities and potential impacts associated with amending 12 existing land use plans within the Upper Snake River District (District) in south-central and eastern Idaho to incorporate fire, fuels, and related vegetation management direction consistent with the Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy.

In February 2002, the BLM published a Notice of Intent in the Federal Register to prepare this DEIS. The agency held six open houses to encourage public input regarding the future fire and fuels and related vegetation management in the District. From this input, BLM developed four conceptual alternatives. Impacts of the four alternatives were analyzed resulting in the identification of a Preferred Alternative. **Alternative D is the Preferred Alternative.**

The DEIS presents a description of each of the four alternatives and contains an analysis of the impacts, consequences, and tradeoffs of implementing each of the alternatives. We invite your comments on the DEIS. We will use your comments in making a final decision among the four alternatives. The final decision may be to implement one of the alternatives in its entirety or to use a combination of various actions contained in more than one of the alternatives.

The Final Plan Amendment will serve as the guiding management strategy for fire, fuels and related vegetation in the District for the next 10 to 15 years by providing a framework for proactive decision making including decisions regarding implementation and site specific project activities.

The DEIS may be found, in its entirety, on the Internet at: **www.id.blm.gov/planning/fmda**. We welcome your comments regarding the content of this document. We are particularly interested in input that addresses: 1) possible flaws in the analysis, 2) new information that would have a bearing on the analysis, or 3) needs for clarification. Specific comments would be most useful. We truly appreciate your assistance and contributions to the future of public lands.

The announcement in the Federal Register that this Draft Plan Amendment and EIS is available starts a 90-day public comment period during which members of the public are encouraged to review the document and provide comments. During this period, written comments may be sent to:

Bureau of Land Management
Attn: Eric Limbach
FMDA Project Manager
4350 Cliffs Drive
Pocatello, ID 83204
Telephone: (208) 478-6392

Or e-mailed to:

ID_USRD_FMDA@ blm.gov

Comments may also be made in person at one of the open houses, which will be held in communities across Southern Idaho. The specific dates and times will be announced via letter, in local newspapers and on the Idaho BLM website.

Sincerely,

Joe Kraayenbrink
District Manager
Upper Snake River District

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT CONSIDERATIONS: *Public comments submitted during this planning review, including names and street addresses of respondents, will be available for public review at the Pocatello Field Office during regular business hours (7:45 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.), Monday through Friday, except holidays. Individual respondents may request confidentiality. If you wish to withhold your name or address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comments. Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law. All submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be made available for public inspection in their entirety.*

Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Fire, Fuels, and Related Vegetation
Management Direction Plan Amendment

Lead Agency:

Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Upper Snake River District

For Further Information, Contact:

Project Manager
Bureau of Land Management
Pocatello Field Office
1111 N. 8th Avenue
Pocatello, Idaho 83201
(208) 478-6340

Abstract

The Upper Snake River District (the District) of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), comprising the Burley, Idaho Falls, Pocatello, and Shoshone Field Offices, proposes to amend the District's 12 existing land use plans to incorporate fire, fuels, and related vegetation management direction to move plant communities in the District towards Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) 1. Alternative B – The Proposed Action encompasses approximately 646,000 footprint-acres and would involve the establishment of Wildland Fire Use (WFU) areas, the application of fire management restrictions to protect resources, and the implementation of broad treatment levels (i.e., footprint-acres) and treatment methods (e.g., chemical, mechanical, and fire-related vegetation treatments) needed to meet resource objectives.

Four alternatives were considered in detail for this project. They were: Alternative A – No Action, Alternative B – The Proposed Action, Alternative C, and Alternative D – The Preferred Alternative. Alternative B – The Proposed Action consists of the District's proposal to increase the use of vegetation treatments and restoration and increase the use of fire in all plant communities except Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, Salt Desert Shrub, and Vegetated Rock/Lava. Alternatives C and D were developed in response to issues raised during public and agency scoping. Alternative C would implement fire treatment levels to meet the goals of the Cohesive Strategy and 10-year Comprehensive Strategy. Alternative D was developed to determine the appropriate level and kind of treatments within the sagebrush steppe ecosystem to meet the Purpose and Need while benefiting sagebrush habitat, sage grouse, and sagebrush-obligate species. Alternative D was picked as the BLM's Preferred Alternative because of the protection it provides for the remaining critical sagebrush steppe habitat left in the Upper Snake River Plain. The No Action Alternative is required by the National

Environmental Policy Act for comparison to the other alternatives analyzed in this EIS. Alternative A – The No Action Alternative would continue existing fire, fuels, and related vegetation management direction, as identified in the current land use plans for the District.

The Idaho BLM State Director is the officer responsible for preparing this Draft EIS.

READER'S GUIDE

This Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) contains information about activities and subsequent potential impacts associated with amending 12 existing land use plans within the Upper Snake River District (District) to incorporate fire, fuels, and related vegetation management direction that is consistent with the Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy. The Proposed Action would do this by returning the vegetation communities in the District to historic fire regime characteristics wherever possible. The information in this Draft EIS is organized to facilitate consideration of the impacts of these activities by the public, other governmental entities, and by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Understanding the structure of this document is crucial to overall understanding of the information required in an EIS. The following provides an overview of the components of this document.

Summary – The summary included in this Draft EIS provides a concise overview of information, analyses, tables, and figures presented in the body of the document.

Table of Contents – A detailed table of contents is presented at the beginning of Chapters 1 through 4. Lists of tables and figures included in each chapter are included in each table of contents.

Chapter 1 – Purpose and Need – Chapter 1 describes the Purpose and Need for the proposal and its scope of analysis. It briefly defines the NEPA process, describes the project area and background, and establishes agency involvement and decisions to be made. The final sections describe scoping and other public involvement activities and list approvals and permits that may be required.

Chapter 2 – The Proposed Action and Alternatives – Chapter 2 includes a description of Alternative A - No Action, Alternative B, and two other action alternatives (Alternatives C and D). The potential environmental impacts of these alternatives on various resources and the potential mitigation measures to alleviate these impacts are summarized at the end of this chapter.

Chapter 3 – The Affected Environment – Chapter 3 describes current physical, biological, social, and economic conditions within the area of influence of the Proposed Action. This information provides the baseline for assessing and comparing the potential impacts of the alternatives. This chapter is subdivided into 14 resource areas/disciplines. This allows readers to target those resources or disciplines of greatest interest to them. It also allows readers to compare information presented in Chapter 4 with corresponding "current conditions" presented in this chapter. Two of these resource disciplines are described in terms of key issues raised during public and agency scoping. These key disciplines include "Cohesive Strategy and Vegetation Resources (Issue 1)" and "Sagebrush Steppe Ecosystem (Issue 2)." The affected environment and environmental consequences for these resources are described at the field office level to better allow the public and the decision-maker to assess potential impacts and implications for field office level planning.

Chapter 4 – Environmental Consequences – Chapter 4 provides a comprehensive scientific and analytical comparison of the potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Action and other action alternatives in relation to the No Action Alternative. In order to facilitate comparison of information provided in Chapters 3 and 4, this chapter is subdivided into the same 14 resource discipline sections as Chapter 3. Using the No Action Alternative as a baseline for comparison and using the existing conditions described in Chapter 3 as a starting point, Chapter 4 discloses the potential short- and long-term, direct and indirect impacts as well as cumulative impacts of each alternative on each resource. Chapter 4 also provides an assessment of the unavoidable impacts of implementing each alternative.

Chapter 5 – Coordination, Consultation, and Distribution – Chapter 5 includes two lists. The first is a list of the Native American Tribes, organizations, agencies, stakeholders, and individuals contacted or consulted with during the scoping process and preparation of the EIS, as well as those agencies, organizations, and persons who provided input to the EIS. The second list contains the names of the agencies, organizations, and individuals who were provided copies of the EIS.

Chapter 6 – List of Preparers – Chapter 6 provides a summary of qualifications and responsibilities of specialists with direct input into the preparation of this EIS.

Chapter 7 – Acronyms and Glossary – Definitions of key words and acronyms used in the EIS are included in this chapter.

Chapter 8 – References – This chapter of the document provides a list of sources of information and data used to prepare this EIS.

Chapter 9 Index – This section provides a list of key words used in the document and the pages where they occur to facilitate cross-referencing and the finding of key information.

Appendixes – Fourteen appendixes are included in the EIS. They contain support information that is important to understanding the analysis.

Maps – Although all figures in the document are numbered sequentially within each section, all those figures that are maps are found in the final section of the document. This facilitates use of the fold-out maps.

SUMMARY - FIRE, FUELS, AND RELATED VEGETATION MANAGEMENT DIRECTION DRAFT PLAN AMENDMENT AND EIS

The Upper Snake River District (hereafter referred to as the District) of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), comprising the Burley, Idaho Falls, Pocatello, and Shoshone Field Offices, administers almost 5.4 million acres of public lands in south-central and eastern Idaho. The District encompasses 23 southern Idaho counties: Bannock, Bear Lake, Bingham, Blaine, Bonneville, Butte, Camas, Caribou, Cassia, Clark, Elmore, Franklin, Fremont, Gooding, Jefferson, Jerome, Lincoln, Madison, Minidoka, Oneida, Power, Teton, and Twin Falls. Major communities found throughout the planning area include: Burley, Idaho Falls, Pocatello, Shoshone, Sun Valley, and Twin Falls. Four field offices at Burley, Idaho Falls, Pocatello, and Shoshone manage numerous parcels of public lands that range in size from less than 40 acres to more than 100,000 acres.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE AND NEED

Background

At present, many of the vegetation types within the District have altered fire regimes that are not within their historical range of variability. Large and/or severe fires in these vegetation types can threaten people and property as well as the resiliency, integrity, and long-term sustainability of ecosystem components and processes. Fires are occurring more frequently and are burning more severely in some vegetation types. The invasion of sagebrush steppe by annual grasses such as cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*) and medusahead rye (*Taeniatherum caput-medusae*) has substantially increased fine fuel loads in these communities, making them more susceptible to large, frequent and severe fires. In other plant communities, fires are occurring less frequently than they did historically, causing undesirable changes in plant species composition and structure and an accumulation of hazardous fuels. Juniper species, for example, are expanding their range at the expense of sagebrush steppe due to a lack of periodic fire. Dry conifer plant communities are slowly replacing aspen and some mountain shrub communities.

Prehistoric and ecological evidence demonstrate that wildland fire was an integral part of the District ecosystem before modern fire suppression was applied. Numerous plant species and communities in the District have responses that enable them to resist, tolerate or take advantage of fire. Since about 1996, wildland fires have occurred in the District at an accelerated rate. The majority of these increases are due to fine fuel loads associated with cheatgrass invasion into sagebrush steppe habitat. Altered fire regimes (i.e. changes in fire frequency, severity, and size) adversely affect public and firefighter safety as well as wildlife habitat, cultural resources, air/visual quality, and grazing.

The District has experienced decreases in fire frequency and attendant increases in fire severity in its aspen, dry conifer, and mountain shrub vegetation types. These vegetation types require more frequent disturbance to decrease fuel loads, facilitate aspen and forb regeneration, and decrease fire intensity.

In light of an increase in severe wildland fires nationwide in 2000, the Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy (USDI and USDA 1995) was revised in 2001 (USDI et al. 2001). Currently, all federal land-management agencies are implementing, or preparing to implement, the updated Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy and its resulting National Fire Plan that serves as the means by which the Policy is applied.

Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action

Current land use plans do not address fire management issues in a comprehensive way. This lack of land use plan level direction has created management challenges in recent years. Even though the need has been identified for increased use of prescribed fire for hazardous fuels reduction, particularly in wildland urban interface areas, current land use plans offer only a limited discussion of the use of prescribed fires and the importance of fire in natural ecosystems. The current land use plans also do not address the recent increase in wildfires (occurrences and intensities) or the large number of acres burned over the past few years. Increased wildfire in the District has adversely affected the public lands and, indirectly, public land users. Furthermore, recent concerns over potential listing of the sage grouse and other wildlife under the Endangered Species Act may be closely related to loss of habitat due to fire.

Amending the land use plans is necessary in order to integrate comprehensive fire management direction into the land use plans. The proposed plan amendments will facilitate updates to the District's fire management plans, which are to be prepared based on objectives in the land use plans. The proposed plan amendments will integrate resource management and fire management activities at the field office and district levels.

The purpose of the proposed fire management plan amendments is to:

- Establish fire management guidance, objectives, policies, and management actions;
- Identify resource goals and methods, including desired future condition of the fire-related vegetation resources, and management actions necessary to achieve objectives;
- Form the basis to update fire management plans and integrate them with allotment management plans, wildlife management plans, recreation management plans, Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing, and other applicable plans, to the greatest extent possible.
- Provide land use plan level direction to enable incremental steps toward a long-term resource goal of conditions that minimize risk to human life and property and maintain or restore vegetation that is resistant to catastrophic wildfire.

The proposed fire management direction plan amendments respond to the following needs:

- Wildfire is a necessary element in the development and maintenance of healthy ecosystems of the Interior Columbia Basin, Snake River Plain, and Great Basin. Fire management direction is needed to establish objectives on the role of fire in the ecosystem.
- Fuel loads have increased to hazardous levels. Fire management direction is needed to establish objectives to treat fuel loads with prescribed fire, as well as mechanical and chemical treatments.

- Wildlife management agencies and environmental groups are concerned with the decline in sage grouse numbers in recent years. This decline has caused an increased demand for the protection of sagebrush steppe communities (i.e., sage grouse habitat). Fire management direction is needed to establish objectives to properly use and/or suppress fire to protect sagebrush steppe communities.
- Aspen, Douglas-fir, juniper and pinyon pine stands require management prescriptions that include prescribed fire to insure ecosystem health, but existing suppression policies have not accommodated this need. In some areas, extensive buildup of fuels and/or un-naturally dense woodland stands could lead to high intensity fires in the future that would lead to stand replacement. Fire management direction is needed to establish objectives to manage fire to maintain these resources.
- Fire management direction is needed to reduce threats to communities at risk from wildfire. Better communication, coordination, cooperation, and training with local communities and rural fire departments are expected to reduce the threat from wildfire in the wildland/urban interface.

Existing Land Use Plans in the District were written in the 1970s or 1980s (Table S.1). The fire management direction in these plans is not current with the National Fire Plan or the Federal Wildland Fire Policy (1995, reviewed and updated in 2001). These plans require amendments.

TABLE S.1. LUPS CURRENTLY GUIDING RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN THE DISTRICT, WITH DATES OF APPROVAL.

Year, Land Use Plan	FO[1]	Year, Land Use Plan	FO[1]
1975, Magic MFP[2]	SH	1982, Twin Falls MFP	BU
1976, Bennett Hills / Timmerman Hills MFP	SH	1983, Big Lost MFP	IF
1981, Big Desert MFP	IF	1985, Cassia RMP[3]	BU
1981, Little Lost-Birch Creek MFP	IF	1985, Medicine Lodge RMP	IF
1981, Malad MFP	PO	1985, Monument RMP	SH/BU
1981, Sun Valley MFP	SH	1988, Pocatello RMP	PO

[1] Field Offices (FO): BU = Burley, IF = Idaho Falls, SH = Shoshone, PO = Pocatello/Malad
[2] Management Framework Plan (MFP)
[3] Resource Management Plan (RMP)

IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES

This section summarizes general issues that helped determine the resources to be analyzed during the planning process.

Water Quality, Watershed, Soils, and Riparian: What would be the impacts on biological crusts, and wind erosion?

Vegetation: What would be the impacts on plant communities and/or the spread of noxious and invasive weeds?

Wildlife: What would be the impacts on big game winter range and calving areas?

Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive (TES) Species: What would be the impacts on terrestrial and aquatic TES species?

Fire Management: How would each of the four alternatives impact wildland fire risk to people and property?

Air Quality: What would be the short- and long-term impacts on air quality?

Cultural: What would be the impacts on significant cultural resources?

ISSUES DRIVING ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT

During internal, public and agency scoping, two issues were identified that suggested a need for alternatives to the Proposed Action. (The Proposed Action is described briefly below.) These issues are summarized below. The alternative descriptions follow the issues.

Issue 1 Under the Proposed Action fewer acres would be identified for treatment than recommended in the proposed program of the draft Cohesive Strategy.

The Proposed Action does not reach the levels of treatment recommended in the draft *Cohesive Strategy for Protecting People and Sustaining Natural Resources* (USDI et al. 2000). Additionally, the Proposed Action does not directly address the goals and priorities identified in both the *Cohesive Strategy* or *the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan*, (USDI and USDA 2002). The goals of the *Cohesive Strategy/Comprehensive Strategy* include: 1) improve fire prevention and suppression, 2) reduce hazardous fuels, 3) restore fire adapted ecosystems, and 4) promote community assistance. The *Cohesive Strategy*, which was prepared by the USDA, projects the quantity and rate of fuels reduction treatments required on a landscape scale to restore altered fire regimes and protect communities from wildland fire. Central themes in the *Cohesive Strategy* are returning fire to its "natural" role in the ecosystem and pursuing a collaborative approach to reduce wildfire risk to communities in fire-prone areas. The *Cohesive Strategy* estimates that fuels reduction treatments need to be increased fivefold to achieve these goals.

Issue 2 Under the Proposed Action, sage grouse could be negatively affected.

Approximately 31 percent of the broad treatment levels in the Proposed Action would occur in sagebrush, adversely affecting sage grouse habitat and populations.

ALTERNATIVES

Alternatives considered for detailed analysis in a Draft EIS are evaluated to determine whether they meet the purpose and need of the proposed project and reduce potential environmental impacts. They must also be technologically and economically feasible. The environmental evaluation for this EIS considered potential effects to soil, water, vegetation, wildlife, air quality, human health and safety, and socioeconomics.

Based on the evaluation criteria, a number of alternatives were eliminated from consideration for further study. Four alternatives remain for detailed analysis in this Draft EIS: Alternative A – No Action, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D – Preferred Alternative.

Proposed Desired Future Condition (DFC) is a management objective common to alternatives B, C, and D that would produce a distribution of vegetation age classes/seral stages across the landscape. This distribution of vegetation age classes/seral stages would reduce hazardous fuels, promote a healthier and more diverse vegetation structure and composition, and return the currently altered fire regimes to more closely parallel historical fire regimes. Proposed Management Goals and Desired Future Condition varies among vegetation types and are presented in Table S.2.

AGE-CLASSES AND SERAL STAGES - Current condition of vegetation and DFC were analyzed for seven vegetation groups using age-classes to approximate seral stages (see Table S.2). It is recognized that age classes and seral stages are not identical, but for any one vegetation group there are rough correspondences between age classes and seral stages. Seral stages better describe the impacts of treatments on resources than do age classes. In the sagebrush steppe ecosystem, for example, it is more meaningful to relate the effects of early-, middle-, and late seral communities on sage grouse populations than it is to relate to the effects of three age classes of vegetation. Furthermore, the District does not routinely collect seral stage data at the landscape level. Thus, there were no landscape level data available for these analyses that could be correlated with seral stages other than 'years since last fire'. In the following discussion, age classes are used to roughly approximate seral stages at the landscape level for purposes of analysis only.

Existing seedings of crested wheatgrass would not be treated where they are established. Restoration treatments would use native species to the extent possible. On sites where seedling establishment has a low probability of success, however, non-native placeholder species like crested wheatgrass or Siberian wheatgrass would be used for revegetation to prevent invasion by cheatgrass and other weeds, to prevent soil erosion, and to structurally mimic native perennial grasses.

TABLE S.2. PROPOSED MANAGEMENT GOALS AND DESIRED FUTURE CONDITION (DFC) FOR VEGETATION COVER TYPES IN THE DISTRICT.

Management Goals	Desired Future Condition	
Low Elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass and Annual Grass	**Vegetation/Fuels Age Classes**	**DFC**
Increase the number of acres with a native/native-like shrub-grass mix. Spatial arrangement of varying age-classes should occur in a mosaic across the landscape.	Perennial Grass;<15 years old Grass/shrub mix: 15-30 years old Shrub/grass mix; >30 years old	14% 14% 52%
No DFC has been set for Crested wheatgrass because no treatments are proposed for these areas.	Crested wheatgrass	N/A
Decrease the number of acres with more than 10% cheatgrass cover and/or weeds.	Cheatgrass/weeds	<20%
Decrease fire frequency and size to more closely approximate the historic fire regime. Improve composition and structure of low elevation shrub, annual and perennial grass types to better represent historical sagebrush steppe communities.		
Mid Elevation Shrub (including juniper encroachment acres)	**Vegetation/Fuels Age Classes**	**DFC**
Increase the number of acres with a native/native like shrub-grass mix. Spatial arrangement of varying age-classes should occur in a mosaic across the landscape.	Perennial Grass; <5 years old Grass/shrub mix; 5-15 years old Shrub/grass mix; >15 years old	23% 45% 23%
Decrease the acres of mid- elevation shrub encroached upon by juniper, and/or any other undesirable species present.	Juniper encroachment Cheatgrass/weeds	7% 2%
Increase acres burned to more closely approximate the historic fire regime. Improve composition and structure of mid-elevation shrub types to better represent historical sagebrush steppe communities.		
Mountain Shrub	**Vegetation/Fuels Age Classes**	**DFC**
Increase the acres of early- and mid-seral mountain shrub vegetation. Spatial arrangement of varying age-classes should occur in a mosaic across the landscape.	Perennial grass/shrub; <10 years old Shrub/perennial grass; 10-20 years old Shrub dominated; >20 years old	33% 33% 33%
Increase acres burned to more closely approximate the historic fire regime. Improve composition and structure of mountain shrub types to better represent historical mountain shrub communities.		
Aspen/Conifer and Dry Conifer	**Vegetation/Fuels Age Classes**	**DFC**
Increase acres of early- and mid-seral aspen/dry conifer vegetation (pure aspen and aspen/conifer mix). Spatial arrangement of varying age-classes should occur in a	Aspen; <30 years old Aspen/conifer mix; 30-50 years	40% 40%

TABLE S.2. PROPOSED MANAGEMENT GOALS AND DESIRED FUTURE CONDITION (DFC) FOR VEGETATION COVER TYPES IN THE DISTRICT.

Management Goals	Desired Future Condition	
mosaic across the landscape.	Dry conifer; >50 years old	20%
Increase acres burned to more closely approximate the historic fire regime. Improve composition and structure of aspen and dry conifer types to better represent historical aspen and dry conifer communities.		
Salt Desert Shrub	**Vegetation/Fuels Age Classes**	**DFC**
Maintain or increase acres with a native/native like shrub-grass mix. Spatial arrangement of varying age-classes should occur in a mosaic across the landscape.	Perennial Grass; <30 years old Shrub/Grass/Bare Ground Mix >30 years old	20% 76%
Decrease acres with cheatgrass, weeds and/or other undesirable species present.	Cheatgrass/Weeds	4%
Maintain fire frequency and size to approximate the historic fire regime. Maintain or improve salt desert shrub types to better represent those historical communities.		
Vegetated Rock Lava	**Vegetation/Fuels Age Classes**	**DFC**
Maintain or increase acres with a native/native like shrub-grass mix. Spatial arrangement of varying age-classes should occur in a mosaic across the landscape.	Perennial Grass Rock/Shrub/Grass/Tree mix	6% 80%
Decrease acres with cheatgrass, weeds and/or other undesirable species present.	Cheatgrass/Weeds	<14%
Maintain fire frequency and size to approximate the historic fire regime. Maintain vegetated rock lave types to better represent those historical communities.		
Wet/Cold Conifer	**Vegetation/Fuels Age Classes**	**DFC**
Maintain the mix of early, mid and late seral stands of lodgepole pine forest.	Shrub/grass; <30 years old Shrub/tree; 30-75 years old Tree Dominated; >75 years old	30% 44% 26%
Maintain fire frequency and size to approximate the historic fire regime. Maintain or improve wet conifer types to better represent historical those communities.		
Wildland Urban Interface (WUI)		
Decrease fire frequency and size in the vicinity of the WUI to protect public/firefighter health and safety.	Decrease fire hazard from 'high' to 'moderate' or 'low' by implementing actions outlined in County/Community Mitigation Plans.	

No Action Alternative

The No Action alternative reflects current LUP direction, and incorporates new policy, guidance and changes in the National Fire Plan. It emphasizes wildland fire suppression and minimizes the

use of wildland fire for resource benefit. Therefore the alternative focuses on reactive stabilization and rehabilitation treatments following wildland fire (about 52 percent of footprint acres) as opposed to proactive restoration treatments (about 48 percent of footprint acres). Vegetation treatments would be conducted on a small scale and emphasize benefits to specific resources, e.g., livestock forage or wildlife habitat.

While existing LUPs lack specific guidance for wildland fire use, restoration actions, hazardous fuels reduction, and WUI protection, the current program includes activities in these areas. These activities are being undertaken in response to new regulations, policy and national direction. These types of activities are compatible with other existing LUP program goals/objectives, and the existing LUPs do not preclude these activities.

No wildland fire use areas are designated in the existing LUPs. Some of the existing LUPs do, however, allow the use of limited fire suppression, which, in some cases, meets the definition of wildland fire use. The District is not currently planning any wildland fire use or limited suppression because of lack of current inventory information and the fact that wildland fire use is not currently a high priority. Instead the current District priorities are rehabilitation and restoration. Under the No Action alternative, wildland fire use may be considered in the future with further planning and NEPA. Over a 10-year period, up to about 250,200 footprint acres would be treated under this alternative.

Alternative B – Proposed Action

Alternative B, the Proposed Action alternative, would incorporate new policy, guidance, and changes in the National Fire Plan that have been developed since the existing LUPs were approved. This alternative emphasizes the increased use of fire, including prescribed fire and wildland fire use, to more closely approximate the historical role of fire and prepare sites for restoration treatments.

Post-wildland fire treatments would be focused to stabilize and rehabilitate areas in the Low-Elevation Shrub, Annual Grass and Mid-Elevation Shrub where juniper encroachment is a problem. Restoration treatments would be focused in Low-Elevation Shrub, Annual Grass, Aspen/Conifer, Dry Conifer, Mountain Shrub, and Mid-Elevation Shrub encroached by juniper. Generally, no wildland fire use areas would be designated where there is important wildlife habitat, past rehabilitation treatments, small tracts of public land, and public health and safety concerns.

Appropriate management response would be used in wildland fire suppression. Full suppression is the appropriate management response where life and property are at risk or in low elevation shrub. Restoration would be emphasized (about 80 percent of footprint acres). Rehabilitation (about 20 % of footprint acres) would be conducted as needed. Over a 10-year period, up to about 646,000 footprint acres would be treated (about three times the acreage in the No Action alternative).

Alternative C

This alternative was designed to address Issue 1. The goals of the Cohesive Strategy and 10-year Comprehensive Plan include: 1) improve fire prevention and suppression, 2) reduce hazardous fuels, 3) restore fire adapted ecosystems, and 4) promote community assistance. Treatment levels, treatment locations, and priorities were developed with these goals in mind.

The emphasis of alternative C is the replication of historical disturbance patterns and succession patterns for the District's 12 vegetation types through use of fire, mechanical, and chemical treatments and adopting the goals and priorities set in the Cohesive Strategy. Alternative C would increase wildland fire use and prescribed fire in vegetation types that historically had more fire disturbance: Mid-Elevation Shrub, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub. This alternative also proposes to decrease the incidence of wildland fire in the Low-Elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass, and Annual Grass types through aggressive pro-active restoration and post-fire rehabilitation of areas dominated by exotic annual grasses, about 91 % of footprint acres and about 9 % of footprint acres, respectively. Over a 10-year period, up to about 1,686,600 footprint acres would be treated (about seven times the acreage in the No Action alternative).

Alternative C differs from alternative B in two major ways: 1) Alternative C would treat all vegetation cover types to a level that returns fire regime to a range of historical variability, and 2) Alternative C is not limited by existing operations capabilities and resources.

Alternative D – Preferred Alternative

This alternative was designed to address *Issue 2*. This alternative recognizes that the sagebrush steppe ecosystem and its associated wildlife species, including sage grouse, are at risk from increased wildfire and other disturbances. The emphasis of this alternative is to maintain existing high quality sagebrush steppe habitat and to increase the quantity of resilient sagebrush steppe through post-wildland fire rehabilitation and proactive restoration. Restoration would be emphasized (about 89 % of footprint acres). Rehabilitation would be conducted (about 11 % of footprint acres) as needed.

Under this alternative, wildland fire suppression efforts would emphasize protection of sagebrush steppe habitats. WFU may be allowed in sage grouse Restoration (R1-3), Key, and Source Habitats for the benefit of the habitat only after site specific project level consultation/ collaboration with IDFG. Vegetation treatments would focus on the Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub, Annual Grass, Perennial Grass and Mountain Shrub types and sagebrush steppe invaded by juniper. Mechanical, chemical, and seeding treatments would be emphasized. Prescribed fire would be used primarily to prepare areas for seeding and to create mosaics for the improvement or enhancement of sagebrush steppe habitats. Restoration priorities would be identified to enlarge and reconnect sagebrush steppe habitat. Over a 10-year period, up to about 1,522,300 footprint acres would be treated (about six times the acreage in the No Action alternative), assuming that implementation of alternative D is not limited by existing operations capabilities and resources.

Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Environmental Analysis

Issues and impacts of concern involving the Proposed Action were identified through the scoping process. Alternatives to the Proposed Action were then developed to provide several ways of addressing the scoping issues and reducing potential environmental impacts, while still achieving the identified purpose and need of the project. Several alternatives for meeting the purpose and need were suggested during the scoping process. Many of these alternatives were considered and subsequently eliminated from detailed analysis for various reasons. A description of these alternatives and the rationale for their elimination is given below.

The alternative of altering or eliminating grazing practices was suggested in the scoping process. While this is closely tied to vegetation conditions and treatments, it does not, in itself, meet the purpose and need of the proposed project. Therefore, it was not considered further as an alternative. Because the Proposed Action aims to update existing LUPs with the Federal Wildland Fire Policy, grazing management has not been directly incorporated into alternative development, but is, instead, addressed in the impacts to resources analysis of Chapter 4.

A scoping respondent suggested that the BLM consider an alternative that would use several passive treatments for fire management. These treatments include using livestock grazing to reduce invasive species, reducing livestock grazing in areas with known exotic infestations, removal of livestock facilities, and the closing of roads and off-road vehicle trails. This alternative was eliminated from detailed analysis because it involves decisions beyond the scope of the this EIS. All of these uses are part of the BLM's multiple-use mandate, and elimination of grazing or off-road recreational access is out of the scope of this process.

A Resource Restoration Emphasis alternative was suggested. This alternative would emphasize the active restoration of rangeland habitats, wetlands, riparian, and aquatic areas. This alternative was eliminated from detailed analysis because it involves elements that are not part of the purpose and need of the project. The purpose and need involves ESR and restoration, but only as they relate to fire management. Non-fire-related restoration of rangeland, wetlands, riparian and aquatic areas is outside of the scope of this project and this EIS analysis.

TABLE S.3 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES A-D.

Alternative Elements	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Management Goals/Objectives	**Objective 1:** Emphasize protection from, and rehabilitation after, wildland fire within the WUI. **Objective 2**: Reduce fine fuels and invasive exotic plants to create perennial vegetation communities so that wildland fire occurs less frequently than currently and at a smaller scale on the landscape. **Objective 3:** Conduct fire and non-fire vegetation treatments in Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub.	**Objective 1:** Make progress towards Desired Future Condition (DFC) in Low-Elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass, and Annual Grass vegetation types where wildland fire should occur *less frequently* than currently and at a smaller scale on the landscape. **Objective 2:** Make progress towards DFC in the Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub vegetation types where wildland fire should occur *more frequently* than currently on the landscape. **Objective 3:** Maintain or make progress towards DFC in the Wet/Cold Conifer, Salt Desert Shrub and vegetation types where fire frequencies are within the historical range of variability.	**Objective 1:** Make progress towards Desired Future Condition (DFC) in Low-Elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass, and Annual Grass vegetation types so that wildland fire occurs *less frequently* than currently and at a smaller scale on the landscape. Reduce by half the number of wildland fires in these vegetation types to create a wildland fire regime within the historical range of variability. **Objective 2:** Make progress towards DFC in the Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub vegetation types by increasing the use of wildland fire and prescribed fire to create a fire regime within the historical range of variability. **Objective 3:** In Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, Salt Desert Shrub, and Vegetated Rock/Lava types	**Objective 1:** Make progress towards Desired Future Condition (DFC) in the Low-Elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass, Annual Grass, Mid-Elevation Shrub, Mountain Shrub and Juniper vegetation types to create a wildland fire regime within the historical range of variability. **Objective 2:** Maintain, protect and expand sage grouse Source Habitats. **Objective 3:** Maintain and improve sage grouse Restoration and Key Habitats.

TABLE S.3 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES A-D.

Alternative Elements	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
			maintain conditions using mechanical, chemical, prescribed fire, or wildland fire use treatments, such that wildland fire regimes are within the historical range of variability. (i.e., maintain the current level of fire in these vegetation types).	
Suppression and Treatment Priorities	Public and fire fighter safety is the first priority in all fire suppression and treatment activities. Protect the wildland - urban interface (WUI) and communities at risk where public and fire fighter health and safety are a concern.			
	Suppression Priorities: Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub communities unless life or property are at risk. Resource priorities would be reviewed annually. **Treatment Priorities:** 1) In areas dominated by cheatgrass, conduct wildland fire rehabilitation or pro-active restoration 2) Accomplish resource-related objectives.	**Suppression Priorities:** Sagebrush steppe, and Dry Conifer **Treatment Priorities:** Sagebrush steppe protection/maintenance. Prioritize treatment to areas that are adjacent to existing sagebrush communities. Sagebrush steppe, Aspen/Conifer, Mountain Shrub, Dry Conifer restoration areas that are at high risk of loss of key ecosystem components.	**Suppression Priorities:** Low-Elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass, and Annual Grass vegetation types where large fires typically occur. **Treatment Priorities:** Landscape level projects where projects designed to reduced the COMBINED risk to human life/property and resources; projects planned in conjunction with active community participation and the development of partnerships with stakeholders	**Suppression Priorities:** Source, Key, and Restoration (R1-R3) sage grouse habitat. **Treatment Priorities:** Within sage grouse Source Habitat, treat areas of low resilience. Within Key and Restoration Habitat: 1) Treat areas adjacent to Source Habitat, 2) Enhance Key Habitat, 3) Treat areas that pose a fire risk to Source and Key Habitats, 4) Treat areas adjacent to Key Habitat.

TABLE S.3 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES A-D.

Alternative Elements	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Wildland Fire Use Suitability	**WFU:** 0 acres **No WFU:** 5,398,200 acres	**WFU:** **3,332,800 acres** **No WFU:** 2,065,400 acres	**WFU:** 2,102,400 acres **Non WFU:** 3,295,800 acres	**WFU:** 430,800 acres **No WFU:** 4,967,400 acres
Broad Treatment Levels (10-year planning period)	**Footprint:** 250,200 acres **WFU:** 0 acres **RxFire:** 36,600 acres **Non-Fire Vegetation Treatments:** 490,400 acres **Post-Fire Rehabilitation:** 52% of Footprint acres **Pro-Active Restoration:** 48% of Footprint acres	**Footprint:** 646,000 acres **WFU:** 112,200 acres **RxFire:** 356,000 acres **Non-Fire Vegetation Treatments:** 1,111,000 acres **Post-Fire Rehabilitation:** 20% of Footprint acres **Pro-Active Restoration:** 80% of Footprint acres	**Footprint:** 1,686,500 acres **WFU:** 129,500 acres **RxFire:** 1,034,600 acres **Non-Fire Vegetation Treatments:** 2,289,600 acres **Post-Fire Rehabilitation:** 8% of Footprint acres **Pro-Active Restoration:** 92% of Footprint acres	**Footprint:** 1,522,300 acres **WFU:** 14,800 acres **RxFire:** 676,500 acres **Non-Fire Vegetation Treatments:** 4,318,000 acres **Post-Fire Rehabilitation:** 12% of Footprint acres **Pro-Active Restoration:** 88% of Footprint acres
Fire Management Restrictions	This alternative would include all restrictions described under "Fire Management Restrictions." Additionally, it would include all management restrictions in current District LUPs.	Wildland Fire Suppression restrictions were developed for cultural resources/historic trails, riparian areas, special management areas, water quality, threatened/endangered/sensitive species and native vegetation. Fire and Non-Fire Vegetation Treatments restrictions were developed for cultural resources and historic trails, riparian areas, special management areas, water quality, livestock grazing, placeholder species, threatened/endangered/sensitive species, fish and wildlife, visual resources, and recreation.		

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

A summary of the affected environment for each of the 14 resource disciplines analyzed in this Draft EIS is given below.

Issue 1* – *Cohesive Strategy (Vegetation Resources)

Vegetation cover types in the District are shown in Table S.4.

TABLE S.4 CURRENT VEGETATION COVER TYPES OF THE DISTRICT.

Vegetation cover type	Characterized By:
Low-Elevation Shrub	Sagebrush steppe: Wyoming big sagebrush, basin big sagebrush, etc., with native grass and forb understory. Biological crust in interspaces.
Perennial Grass*	Sagebrush steppe: Seeded areas (native/exotic) and native grasslands (bluebunch wheatgrass, needlegrass, Idaho fescue, etc.). Biological crust may be present in interspaces.
Annual Grass*	Potential sagebrush steppe: Principally, cheatgrass and medusahead wildrye. Biological crust may be present in interspaces.
Mid-Elevation Shrub	Sagebrush steppe: Mountain big sagebrush, low sagebrush, bitterbrush, etc., with native grass and forb understory. Biological crust may be present in interspaces.
Juniper	Rocky Mountain juniper, Utah juniper, limber pine and /or single leaf pine. Natural juniper (~12 percent juniper area), pinyon-juniper (~5 percent juniper area), and juniper encroachment in sagebrush steppe habitat (~83 percent juniper area), Biological crust may be present in interspaces.
Dry Conifer	Douglas-fir, limber pine, ponderosa pine.
Aspen/Conifer	Includes healthy stands of aspen and stands of aspen and invading conifer.
Mountain Shrub	Serviceberry, buckbrush (Ceanothus), snowberry, mountain mahogany, bigtooth maple, chokecherry, antelope bitterbrush, etc., with native grass and forb understory.
Wet/Cold Conifer	Lodgepole, Subalpine fire, Engelmann spruce, etc.
Riparian Areas	Streamside and wetland areas of cottonwood, willow, etc.
Salt Desert Shrub	Atriplex spp. (four-wing, shadscale), spiny hopsage, winterfat, greasewood, etc., with native grass and forb understory. Biological crust in interspaces.
Other/Vegetated Lava	Lava, sand dunes, barren areas, etc.

* Historically these areas were dominated by low-elevation sagebrush steppe.

Prior to 1900, fire played an essential role in the landscape by regenerating and maintaining a diverse mosaic of healthy vegetation cover types across ecosystems dominated by vegetation characteristic of Fire Regime Condition Class 1 (FRCC 1 = low risk of losing key ecosystem

components). Particular areas (watersheds, benches, swales, plains) would have been in various stages of recovery from wildland fires and other disturbances, classified along a gradient of Fire Regime Condition Classes 1 through 3 (FRCC 3 = high risk of losing key ecosystem components). Over the past century, fire suppression, introduction of exotics (e.g., cheatgrass and medusahead wildrye), and other land management practices have altered fire ecology and the dynamics of succession across the District landscape. Among other effects, this has resulted in a relatively stable exotic vegetation type, the annual cheatgrass community, on many potential acres of sagebrush steppe. Other plant communities have been fragmented, have lost vegetation age-class structure, or suffer from fuel loading.

Special Status Plants

Forty-seven special status plant taxa are known to occur in the District. Sixteen additional species have "Review" or "Monitor" status. Little is known about the distribution, size, and trend of special status plant populations within the District. Most of the information is limited to habitat and population structure information collected with new species locations. Most monitoring programs are recent; and, therefore, long-term data regarding the response of a special status plant to disturbance are rare to non-existent. This includes data on the response of these taxa to fire.

Only one special status plant, *Spiranthes diluvialis* (Ute's ladies-tresses), is protected by its listing as Threatened under the Endangered Species Act. This riparian species has a highly limited distribution along the South Fork Snake River. Monitoring of the South Fork populations began in 1997, and modifications to the monitoring methods were adapted in 2001 (Moseley 1998, 2000; Murphy 2000, 2001a, 2001b). A human-caused wildland fire burned a portion of the Annis Island population of *Spiranthes diluvialis* during late spring, 2001. Flowering plants were observed in lightly burned areas of the fire, but it is too early to determine the overall effects of the fire to the population at this time (Murphy 2001a).

***Issue 2* – Sagebrush Wildlife Guild Habitats**

The historical extent and distribution of sagebrush steppe communities across southern Idaho has dramatically decreased over the last century from conversion of these lands to agriculture, seeded ranges and most recently, from cheatgrass invasion and altered fire regimes. At present, Perennial Grass and Annual Grass cover types principally occur in historic sagebrush steppe communities. Perennial grasslands are predominately seeded ranges or recovering burned areas, while annual grasslands are dominated by the invasive, annual cheatgrass.

Sagebrush-obligate wildlife species (Sagebrush Guild) are negatively affected by the loss of suitable habitat through these conversions of shrub steppe habitat to grasslands. Representative sagebrush-obligate wildlife species include pronghorn, pygmy rabbit, greater sage grouse, sage sparrow, sagebrush lizard, and short-horned lizard. These Sagebrush Guild species are highly dependent upon the various subspecies of sagebrush, predominately Wyoming and Basin big sagebrush with Mountain sagebrush occurring in the transition zone between the Mid-Elevation and Mountain Shrub cover types. Sagebrush Guild wildlife species may utilize Annual and Perennial Grass types adjacent to Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub. Shrub types provide thermal cover and refuge (hiding) and the grasslands provide foraging areas.

Wildland Urban Interface

The District is an area that has a high potential for damage by wildland fires along the wildland urban interface. The BLM promotes local involvement in wildland fire concerns though approximately 63 mutual aid agreements with the District's counties.

Wildlife Resources

To facilitate the description of existing wildlife resources at the district-wide level required for this EIS, it was decided to categorize wildlife species into guilds associated with the vegetation cover types described in the vegetation section. This allows the analysis to focus impacts analysis on key wildlife species representative of the suites of species that use each vegetation type. These guilds are noted below.

Annual Grassland - Representative species in the District that inhabit or use this community include the long-billed curlew, and burrowing owl.

Perennial Grassland - Representative wildlife species that inhabit this community include California bighorn sheep, Columbian sharp-tailed grouse, meadowlark, short-eared owl, and montane vole.

Salt Desert Shrub - The horned lark is the only guild species analyzed for this community. The horned lark is a widespread species that occurs throughout the District year-round. It occurs in open country, but can be found from the prairies to the tundra, as well as developed areas such as airports and golf courses (Stebbins 1985). It nests on the ground in shallow depressions and feeds on insects, spiders and grass and forb seeds. This species is quite adaptable and is still quite common.

Riparian Community - Species analyzed as part of this community guild include white-tailed deer, bald eagle, yellow-billed cuckoo, northern leopard frog, boreal toad, common garter snake, and Yellowstone cutthroat trout.

Juniper and Mountain Shrub- Wildlife species representative of these communities include mule deer, mountain lion, ferruginous hawk, juniper titmouse, and gray flycatcher.

Wet/Cold Conifer, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer-Wildlife species representative of these communities include the Rocky Mountain elk, moose, snowshoe hare, northern goshawk, three-toed woodpecker, ruffed grouse, and red-naped sapsucker.

Special Status Wildlife Species- Forty-one special status animal taxa are known to occur in the District.

Wildlife habitat management on the District's public lands consists of maintaining and/or improving food, water and cover for over 100 species of mammals, 300 species of birds, 48 species of fish, 17 species of reptiles and 7 species of amphibians. Big game species in the District include elk, mule deer, white-tailed deer, pronghorn antelope, bighorn sheep, black bear and mountain lion. Water resources in the District support fisheries that include rainbow trout,

brown trout, native Yellowstone cutthroat trout, bull trout, redband trout, Bonneville cutthroat trout, Bear Lake whitefish, Bonneville whitefish, Bonneville cisco, and Bear Lake sculpin. Upland game species include greater sage grouse, Columbian sharp-tailed grouse, blue grouse, ruffed grouse, gray partridge, wild turkey, ring-necked pheasant, mourning dove, chukar, and black-tailed jackrabbit. In addition to these upland species, the District provides habitat for several waterfowl and wetland species.

Air Quality

Idaho DEQ operates an extensive ambient air monitoring network to identify attainment and nonattainment areas. Within the District boundaries there are two PM_{10} nonattainment areas including Portneuf Valley (Pocatello area) and Fort Hall Indian Reservation (a Tribal/EPA PM_{10} nonattainment area). Other PM_{10} nonattainment areas within the area of consideration (100 km beyond District boundaries) include the northern portion of Ada County (Boise area) and the northern portion of Davis County, Utah, including the city of Ogden. Violations primarily consist of an excedence of the 24-hour standard during the winter months when strong inversions trap pollutants (IDEQ 2002).

Geology and Soils

The District falls into four physiographic provinces: Columbia Plateau – Snake River Plain (SRP) Section, Basin and Range – Great Basin Section, Middle Rocky Mountains, and the Northern Rocky Mountains. Soils of the District are primarily of five soil orders: Entisols, Inceptisols, Aridisols, Alfisols, and Mollisols. Soil depth in the District is generally deep (greater than 48 inches to bedrock) on flat, low terrain of the Snake River Plain (0-to-15-percent slope). On gently rolling uplands (0- to 30-percent slope), slightly altered bedrock is often more than 40 inches below the surface. On more rolling lands (20-to-50-percent slope), the depth to bedrock is about 20 inches to 40 inches. On steep slopes (30-to-60-percent slope), soil depths range from less than 10 inches to 20 inches and overlie partly weathered bedrock. Rock outcrops are common on steeper slopes with little or no soil development.

Water Resources

The geologic provinces of the District landscape help define various types of surface waters: lakes, ponds, and reservoirs; ephemeral springs and seeps; steep brooks; meandering streams; seasonally flooded meadows and playas; rivers, rapids and riffles; and reaches in narrow, rocky canyons. Surface waters on, or adjacent to, District public lands total over 18 square miles and nearly 1,500 linear miles.

Livestock Grazing Management

Livestock grazing occurs on 4.6 million acres, or 85 percent, of BLM-administered land in the District. For grazing administrative purposes, the District is divided into 1,278 grazing allotments. Currently, there are 1,120 allotments actively grazed, 31 allotments under permit/lease but not currently grazed, 77 allotments not under permit/lease but available for grazing, and about 800,000 acres not allocated and not available for livestock grazing. BLM-administered grazing allotments can be used by one operator as an individual allotment, or by

many operators in a common allotment. There are approximately 1,145 livestock operators authorized to graze livestock on the 1,120 active grazing allotments. The grazing allotments vary in size from less then 10 acres to 318,000 acres. Several of the livestock operations include private, state, and NFS lands in addition to BLM-administered lands.

Recreational Resources

Public lands provide a setting for dispersed as well as developed recreational opportunities, which in the District include, but are not limited to, hunting, fishing, sightseeing, mountain biking, hang gliding, OHV and snowmobile use, cross country and alpine skiing, hiking, camping, caving, river running and boating, horseback riding, and picnicking. These activities are managed through special recreation permits, camping and picnic facilities, roads and trails, information signs, and bulletin boards and kiosks. Some of the major attractions within the District include the Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve, City of Rocks National Reserve, Bald Mountain Recreation Area, the historic Oregon Trail, and the Snake River.

Wilderness Resources

There is no designated wilderness on BLM-administered lands. However, the District contains 31 Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs), which the BLM manages, some of which share administration with other districts (Lower Snake River District [LSRD], Upper Columbia Salmon Clearwater District [UCSCD]), or agencies (NPS, US Forest Service [USFS]). Additionally, there is designated wilderness managed by the NPS and USFS within the District boundaries.

Visual Resources

The landscapes within the District that could be affected by wildland fire and fire vegetation treatments exhibit an extraordinary range of visual diversity, including rugged, northwest-to-southeast-trending mountains and flat valleys; steep-sided extinct volcanoes; cinder cones; sand dunes; widely-spaced mountains; and high, rugged, glaciated mountains. Lower elevations are characterized by sagebrush, juniper woodlands, and grasslands while upper elevations include spruce, fir, pine, and aspen forest. This diversity of topography, vegetation, and geological formations provides a variety of scenic experiences to those who live, work, or recreate in the area.

Cultural Resources

Despite the small percentage of lands that have been inventoried for cultural resources, approximately 9,100 sites have been documented within the District. These sites represent a variety of types and chronological periods, dating from at least 11,000 years old to the present. Identified prehistoric sites include lithic scatters, quarries, rockshelters, rock structures and piles, and pictographs/petroglyphs. Historic sites include homesteads, railroad and trail corridors, agricultural or ranching sites, debris scatters, inscriptions, and other manifestations of historical exploration and occupation.

Native American Concerns

Native Americans and their ancestors have subsisted on lands within the District for thousands of years. Existing ethnographic information generally suggests that aboriginal populations constantly traversed the Snake River Plain during their seasonal subsistence rounds, moving to the Camas Prairie in the spring and then further into the mountains for the summer. In the fall, they would return to the Snake River for the winter. The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes hunt game on BLM-administered lands today, and they continue to ascribe cultural value to the Snake River corridor and the Camas Prairie. Two other tribal groups, the Northwest Band of Shoshone Nation and the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes, also identify portions of the District as traditional territory.

Socioeconomics

The District encompasses a portion of Idaho with a socially diverse population and a broad economic base. While the diversity is evident, a common characteristic that binds this region is its rural nature. Out of 23 counties in the District, 20 are considered rural. Abundant natural resources in rural areas define the important relationship between BLM land management and the socioeconomic condition of a region.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

The Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action and the two action alternatives in relation to the No Action Alternative are summarized in Table S.5 below.

TABLE S.5 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE EFFECTS.

Vegetation – Cohesive Strategy (Issue 1): Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) by alternatives at 30 years in respective Field Offices. FRCC 1 = low risk of losing key ecosystem components, FRCC 3 = high risk of losing key ecosystem components.

Vegetation Cover Types	Field Offices															
	Idaho Falls				Pocatello				Burley				Shoshone			
	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
LES [1], Perennial, Annual	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2
MES [2], Juniper	3	2	1	2	3	3	1	2	3	2	1	2	3	3	1	2
Mountain Shrub	3	2	1	3	3	1	1	1	3	2	1	2	3	2	1	2
Aspen, Dry Conifer	2	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	1	3	3	2	2	3
Salt Desert Shrub	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA[3]	NA	NA	NA
Other/Vegetated Lava	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Wet/Cold Conifer	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2

There are no treatments proposed for the Riparian cover type in any of the four alternatives. However, they may receive some treatment depending on the needs of the adjacent vegetation types.

[1] LES = Low-Elevation Shrub [2] MES = Mid-Elevation Shrub [3] Not Applicable (NA): Shoshone has no vegetation mapped as Salt Desert Shrub.

TABLE S.5 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE EFFECTS. (CONTINUED)

Vegetation – Cohesive Strategy (Issue 1): District Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) by alternatives at 30 years.
FRCC 1 = low risk of losing key ecosystem components, FRCC 3 = high risk of losing key ecosystem components.

Vegetation Cover Types	Alternatives			
	A	B	C	D
Low-Elevation Shrub, Perennial, Annual	2 - 3	2	2	2
Middle-Elevation Shrub, Juniper	3	2 - 3	1	2
Mountain Shrub	3	1 - 2	1	1 - 3
Aspen, Dry Conifer	2 - 3	2 - 3	1 - 2	3
Salt Desert Shrub	1	1	1	1
Other/Vegetated Lava	1	1	1	1
Wet/Cold Conifer	2	2	1 - 2	2

[1] There are no treatments proposed for the Riparian cover type in any of the four alternatives. However, they may receive some treatment depending on the needs of the adjacent vegetation types.

TABLE S.5 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE EFFECTS. (CONTINUED)

	No Action Alternative	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Sagebrush Wildlife Guild Habitats (Issue 2)	Under all alternatives, the proportion of Source Habitat that would be disturbed by vegetation treatments indicates habitat loss over the short term for the Sagebrush Guild wildlife species. The percentage of mature, Low-Elevation Shrub at 30-years old, or more, provides an assessment of long-term benefits to the Sagebrush Guild.			
	Idaho Falls Field Office: Source Habitat disturbed in first 10 years..... 0 % Mature shrub at 30 years: ..... 37 %	**Idaho Falls Field Office**: Source Habitat disturbed in first 10 years:..... 6.9 % Mature shrub at 30 years: ..... 28 %	**Idaho Falls Field Office**: Source Habitat disturbed in first 10 years:.....7.7 % Mature shrub at 30 years: .....40 %	**Idaho Falls Field Office**: Source Habitat disturbed in first 10 years: .....9.9 % Mature shrub at 30 years: .....41 %
	Pocatello Field Office: Source Habitat disturbed in first 10 years:..... 0 % Mature shrub at 30 years: ..... 20 %	**Pocatello Field Office**: Source Habitat disturbed in first 10 years:..... 0 % Mature shrub at 30 years: ..... 20 %	**Pocatello Field Office**: Source Habitat disturbed in first 10 years:.....23.5 % Mature shrub at 30 years: .....22 %	**Pocatello Field Office**: Source Habitat disturbed in first 10 years: .....15.7 % Mature shrub at 30 years: .....25 %
	Burley Field Office: Source Habitat disturbed in first 10 years..... 0 % Mature shrub at 30 years: ..... 12 %	**Burley Field Office**: Source Habitat disturbed in first 10 years:..... 2.6 % Mature shrub at 30 years: ..... 15 %	**Burley Field Office**: Source Habitat disturbed in first 10 years:.....13.7 % Mature shrub at 30 years: .....21 %	**Burley Field Office:** Source Habitat disturbed in first 10 years: .....12.4 % Mature shrub at 30 years: .....21 %
	Shoshone Field Office: Source Habitat disturbed in first 10 years..... 0 % Mature shrub at 30 years: .....12 %	**Shoshone Field Office:** Source Habitat disturbed in first 10 years:..... 0 % Mature shrub at 30 years: ..... 14 %	**Shoshone Field Office:** Source Habitat disturbed in first 10 years: .....2.3 % Mature shrub at 30 years: .....24 %	**Shoshone Field Office:** Source Habitat disturbed in first 10 years: .....8.5 % Mature shrub at 30 years: .....17 %
Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Areas of Concern	Low Risk.....15 areas Moderate Risk .....15 areas	Low Risk:.....27 areas Moderate Risk: .....6 areas	Low Risk: ..... 29 areas Moderate Risk: ..... 5 areas	Low Risk: ..... 29 areas Moderate Risk:.....4 areas

TABLE S.5 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE EFFECTS. (CONTINUED)

	No Action Alternative	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	High Risk.....4 areas Least amount of treatment in, and adjacent to, the WUI areas would result in: - Continued full-scale suppression as the primary tool in reacting to wildland fires, - Continued wildland fire damage to property, - Increased financial and labor costs, and - Risk to public and firefighter health and safety.	High Risk: ..... 1 area Those WUI areas that receive the most treatments would result in vegetation communities that: - Are more resilient to wildland fire, - Have reduced woody fuel loads thus less fire intensity - Pose less risk to wildland urban interface areas. If treatment involves wildland fire use and prescribed fire, there would be some risk to the public and fighter health and safety, though it would be expected that the effects of treatment would reduce the incidence of catastrophic wildfire by reducing fuel load, increasing defensible space, and restoring vegetation communities where feasible.	High Risk: ..... 0 area Same as Alternative B.	High Risk: .....1 area Similar to Alternative B with the exception that Alternative D focuses on Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass, and Annual Grass vegetation communities.
Wildlife	- 250,200 footprint acres under this alternative would be unavailable to wildlife for portions of the following 10 years. However, areas being rehabilitated or restored would continue to provide habitat value to certain	- 646,000 footprint acres under this alternative would be unavailable to wildlife for portions of the following 10 years. However, areas being rehabilitated or restored would continue to provide habitat value to certain	- 1,686,600 footprint acres under this alternative would be unavailable to wildlife for portions of the following 10 years. However, areas being rehabilitated or restored would continue to provide habitat value to certain	- 1,522,400 footprint acres under this alternative would be unavailable to wildlife for portions of the following 10 years. However, areas being rehabilitated or restored would continue to provide habitat value to certain

TABLE S.5 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE EFFECTS. (CONTINUED)

	No Action Alternative	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	species, particularly those that utilize early to mid-seral vegetation stages. - Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) in Annual Grass, Perennial Grass and Low- Elevation Shrub would remain at 2, with corresponding moderate risk to wildlife guilds using these vegetation types. - Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, and Mountain Shrub would remain in FRCC 3 with higher risk of long-term adverse impacts to wildlife guilds using these vegetation types. - Aspen and Dry Conifer FRCC would vary from 2 to 3 throughout the District with corresponding moderate-to-high risk to wildlife habitat in these vegetation types. - Salt Desert Shrub, Riparian, and Vegetated Lava would remain in FRCC 1 with low risk to wildlife species using these vegetation types.	species, particularly those that utilize early to mid-seral vegetation stages. - Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) in Annual Grass, Perennial Grass and Low-Elevation Shrub would remain at 2, with corresponding moderate risk to wildlife guilds using these vegetation types. - Mid-Elevation Shrub and Juniper would range from 2 to 3 across the District with moderate and high risk to species using these vegetation types. - Mountain Shrub would range from FRCC 2 to 1 across the District with moderate-to-low risk to species using this vegetation type. - Aspen and Dry Conifer FRCC would be 2 throughout the District with corresponding moderate risk to wildlife habitat in these vegetation types. - Salt Desert Shrub, Riparian, and Vegetated Lava would remain in FRCC 1 with low risk to wildlife species using these	species, particularly those that utilize early to mid-seral vegetation stages. - Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) in Annual Grass, Perennial Grass and Low-Elevation Shrub would remain at 2, with corresponding moderate risk to wildlife guilds using these vegetation types. - Mid-Elevation Shrub and Juniper would be FRCC 1 across the District with low risk to species using these vegetation types. - Mountain Shrub FRCC would range from 3 to 1 with low-to-moderate risk to species using this vegetation type. - Aspen and Dry Conifer FRCC would be 2 to 3 throughout the District with corresponding moderate-to-high risk to wildlife species in these vegetation types. - Salt desert shrub, riparian, and vegetated lava would remain in FRCC 1 with low risk to wildlife species using these vegetation types.	species, particularly those that utilize early to mid-seral vegetation stages. - Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) in Annual Grass, Perennial Grass and Low-Elevation Shrub would remain at 2, with corresponding moderate risk to wildlife species using these vegetation types. - Mid-Elevation Shrub and Juniper would have an FRCC of 2 across the District with moderate risk to species using these vegetation types. - Mountain Shrub FRCC would range from 2 to 3 with moderate-to-high risk to species using this vegetation type. - Aspen and Dry Conifer FRCC would be 3 throughout the District with corresponding high risk to wildlife species in these vegetation types. - Salt Desert Shrub, Riparian, and Vegetated Lava would remain in FRCC 1 with low risk to wildlife species using these vegetation types.

TABLE S.5 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE EFFECTS. (CONTINUED)

	No Action Alternative	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
		vegetation types.		
Special Status Plants	Under all alternatives, site specific project effects on special status plants would be evaluated in light of the status of the taxa, population health and integrity, ecology and response to disturbance, and habitat quality.			
	Low-Elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass, Annual Grass: - Would treat approximately **6 percent** of vegetation types to benefit special status plant habitat by reestablishing the structure, species composition, and seral dynamics of the native community. - Prescribed fire on about 14,000 acres would benefit species that require open light and openings in early to mid-seral communities. Species characteristic of late seral communities would possibly be less tolerant of burning treatments due to shading or nutrient requirements.	*Low-Elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass, Annual Grass:* - Would treat approximately **12 percent** of vegetation types to benefit special status plant habitat by reestablishing the structure, species composition, and seral dynamics of the native community. - Wildland fire use and prescribed fire on about 320,000 acres would benefit species that require open light and openings in early to mid-seral communities. Species characteristic of late seral communities would possibly be less tolerant of burning treatments due to shading or nutrient requirements.	*Low-Elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass, Annual Grass:* - Would treat approximately **37 percent** of vegetation types to benefit special status plant habitat by reestablishing the structure, species composition, and seral dynamics of the native community. - Wildland fire use and prescribed fire on about 258,000 acres would benefit species that require open light and openings in early to mid-seral communities. Species characteristic of late seral communities would possibly be less tolerant of burning treatments due to shading or nutrient requirements.	*Low-Elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass, Annual Grass:* - Would treat approximately **30 percent** of vegetation types to benefit special status plant habitat by reestablishing the structure, species composition, and seral dynamics of the native community. - Prescribed fire on about 500,000 acres would benefit species that require open light and openings in early to mid-seral communities. Species characteristic of late seral communities would possibly be less tolerant of burning treatments due to shading or nutrient requirements.
	Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, including areas of juniper encroachment: - Special status species that occur on relatively fire-resistant, sparsely vegetated, rocky sites would	*Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, including areas of juniper encroachment:* - Same as No Action Alternative. - Would treat approximately **15 percent** of vegetation	*Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, including areas of juniper encroachment:* - Same as No Action Alternative. - Would treat approximately **50 percent** of vegetation	*Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, including areas of juniper encroachment:* - Same as No Action Alternative. - Would treat approximately **28 percent** of vegetation

TABLE S.5 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE EFFECTS. (CONTINUED)

	No Action Alternative	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	not be impacted. - Would treat approximately **3 percent** of vegetation types with benefits dependent upon seral status and tolerance to fire, as well as competitive ability and shade tolerance. Potential negative long-term effects would be due to lack of treatment and continued degradation of habitat.	**15 percent** of vegetation types with benefits dependent upon seral status and tolerance to fire, as well as competitive ability and shade tolerance. Potential negative long-term effects would be due to lack of treatment and continued degradation of habitat.	**50 percent** of vegetation types with benefits dependent upon seral status and tolerance to fire, as well as competitive ability and shade tolerance. Potential positive effects would be due to maintaining a seral community and/or expanding potential habitat on a landscape scale.	**28 percent** of vegetation types with benefits dependent upon seral status and tolerance to fire, as well as competitive ability and shade tolerance. Potential positive effects would be due to maintaining a seral community and/or expanding potential habitat on a landscape scale.
	Salt Desert Shrub: - Would treat approximately **3 percent** of vegetation type. Unlikely that treatments would impact any special status plant populations.	*Salt Desert Shrub:* - No treatment proposed. Unlikely to impact any special status plant populations.	*Salt Desert Shrub:* - Same as Alternative B.	*Salt Desert Shrub:* - Same as Alternative B.
	Aspen/Dry Conifer: - Would treat approximately **3 percent** of vegetation types with benefits dependent upon the seral status, tolerance to fire, competitive ability, and shade tolerance.	*Aspen/Dry Conifer:* - Would treat approximately **21 percent** of vegetation types with benefits dependent upon the seral status, tolerance to fire, competitive ability, and shade tolerance.	*Aspen/Dry Conifer:* - Would treat approximately **14 percent** of vegetation types with benefits dependent upon the seral status, tolerance to fire, competitive ability, and shade tolerance.	*Aspen/Dry Conifer:* - No treatment proposed. Unlikely to impact any special status plant populations though may indirectly impact special status species that require openings in the aspen vegetation type.
	Mountain Shrub: - Would treat approximately	*Mountain Shrub:*	*Mountain Shrub:*	*Mountain Shrub:*

TABLE S.5 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE EFFECTS. (CONTINUED)

	No Action Alternative	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	< 1 percent of vegetation type with benefits dependent upon seral status, tolerance to fire, competitive ability, and shade tolerance. Potential negative long-term effects would be due to lack of treatment and continued degradation of habitat.	- Would treat approximately **9 percent** of vegetation type with benefits dependent upon seral status, tolerance to fire, competitive ability, and shade tolerance. Potential negative long-term effects would be due to lack of treatment and continued degradation of habitat.	- Would treat approximately **42 percent** of vegetation type with benefits dependent upon seral status, tolerance to fire, competitive ability, and shade tolerance. Potential positive effects would be due to maintaining a seral community and/or expanding potential habitat on a landscape scale.	- Would treat approximately **13 percent** of vegetation type with benefits dependent upon seral status, tolerance to fire, competitive ability, and shade tolerance. Potential positive effects would be due to maintaining a seral community and/or expanding potential habitat on a landscape scale.
	Wet/Cold Conifer: There are no special status species associated with the wet/cold conifer vegetation type.	*Wet/Cold Conifer:* Same as No Action Alternative.	*Wet/Cold Conifer:* Same as No Action Alternative.	*Wet/Cold Conifer:* Same as No Action Alternative.
	Riparian: It is not anticipated that areas supporting special status plants would be treated, unless site specific information indicates that small-scale prescribed fire use would maintain a seral community beneficial to the taxa.	*Riparian:* No treatment proposed. Unlikely to impact any special status plant populations.	*Riparian:* Same as No Action Alternative.	*Riparian:* Same as Alternative B.
	Other/Vegetated Lava: No treatment proposed. Unlikely to impact any special status plant populations.	*Other/Vegetated Lava:* Same as No Action Alternative.	*Other/Vegetated Lava:* Same as No Action Alternative.	*Other/Vegetated Lava:* Same as No Action Alternative.

TABLE S.5 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE EFFECTS. (CONTINUED)

	No Action Alternative	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Air Quality	**Emissions (tons/10-years):** **- PM_{10}** .....1,463 **- $PM_{2.5}$**.....1,233	**Emissions (tons/10-years):** **- PM_{10}** .....20,235 **- $PM_{2.5}$**..... 17,024	**Emissions (tons/10-years):** **- PM_{10}** ..... 26,172 **- $PM_{2.5}$**..... 21,797	**Emissions (tons/10-years):** **- PM_{10}**..... 9,052 **- $PM_{2.5}$** 7,468
Soil Resources	Least amount of water and wind erodible soils disturbance (**40,724 and 169,935 acres**, respectively).	Would disturb **109,019 acres** of water erodible soils and 397,415 acres of wind erodible soils.	Most amount of water and wind erodible soils disturbance, **323,058 and 1,060,027 acres**, respectively.	Would impact **245,051 acres** of water erodible soils and **969,389 acres** of wind erodible soils.
Water Resources	Less than **1 percent** of the proposed treatments in all vegetation communities would occur on water-erodible soils. Thus, overall, short-term impacts to water resources would be negligible across the District.	Approximately **6 percent** of the proposed treatments for all vegetation communities would occur on wind-erodible soils, while less than **2 percent** would occur on water-erodible soils, with concomitant risk of sedimentation and short-term impacts to water quality in the District.	Approximately **17 percent** of the proposed treatments for all vegetation communities would occur on wind-erodible soils, while about **6 percent** would occur on water-erodible soils, resulting in concomitant risk of sedimentation and short-term impacts to water quality in the District.	Approximately **19 percent** of the proposed treatments for all plant communities would occur on wind-erodible soils, while about **5 percent** would occur on water-erodible soils, resulting in concomitant risk of sedimentation and short-term impacts to water quality in the District.
Livestock Grazing Management	Would result in about **4,750 AUMs** (0.7 percent) being temporarily unavailable annually.	Would result in about **12,278 AUMs** (1.8 percent) being temporarily unavailable annually.	Would result in about **32,047 AUMs** (4.8 percent) being temporarily unavailable annually.	Would result in about **28,927 AUMs** (4.3 percent) being temporarily unavailable annually.
Recreation	Could have direct impacts by decreasing public access to recreational areas during treatment and recovery periods.	Would have short-term direct impacts by decreasing access to more recreational areas during treatment and recovery periods than the No Action Alternative.	Would have short-term direct impacts by decreasing access to more recreational areas during treatment and recovery periods than for any of the other alternatives. Dispersed recreation, such as hunting and all-terrain vehicle riding, could be adversely affected in the	Would have short-term direct impacts by decreasing access to recreational areas during treatment and recovery periods at levels close to alternatives C. Dispersed recreation, such as hunting and all-terrain vehicle riding, could be adversely affected in the

TABLE S.5 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE EFFECTS. (CONTINUED)

	No Action Alternative	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
			short term through decreased access to treated areas.	short term through decreased access to treated areas.
Wilderness	Treatments in Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) that follow the guidance in BLM handbook H-8551 (Interim Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review) would not impair wilderness values under any alternative.			
	Effects of current direction's full wildland fire suppression would not result in any short-term, discernible change from current conditions.	Treatments in Other/Vegetated Lava (about 50 percent of the WSAs) would only include Wildland Fire Use. The remaining plant communities that are within WSAs would receive, in general, about **2.6 times** more treatment than under the No Action Alternative. Treatment impacts may be perceived to decrease the wilderness values of these WSAs in the short term.	Anticipated treatment impacts would be similar to those under Alternative B for Other/Vegetated Lava communities. The remaining plant communities that are within WSAs would, in general, be **6.7 times** more likely to receive treatment than under the No Action Alternative.	There are no treatments proposed in Other/Vegetated Lava. The remaining plant communities that are within WSAs would, in general, be **6.1 times** more likely to receive treatment than under the No Action Alternative.
Visual Resources	Key viewpoints would be maintained in FRCC 3 with the exception of some portions of the Ohio Gulch viewshed that would be FRCC 2. This would result in moderate-to-high visual quality degradation from atmospheric particulates and large-scale landscape scorching as seen from these viewpoints.	Key viewpoints would be maintained in FRCC 3 with the exception of Appendicitis Hill WSA viewshed, where vegetation could move to FRCC 2, resulting in lessened potential for visual quality degradation.	Key viewpoints would be maintained in FRCC 1 with the exception of some portions of the Appendicitis Hill WSA, which would remain in FRCC 2. This would result in substantially reduced potential for major visual quality degradation from atmospheric particulates and large-scale landscape scorching as seen from these viewpoints.	Key viewpoints would be maintained in FRCC 3, 2, and 1 with similar visual impacts to those described for Alternative B.

TABLE S.5 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE EFFECTS. (CONTINUED)

	No Action Alternative	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Cultural Resources and Native American Concerns	An estimated **250,200 footprint-acres** would be subject to mechanical treatment, chemical treatment, prescribed fire, or seeding over a 10-year period. However, standard BLM practice entails measures such as pre-action inventory and avoidance that would likely mitigate these impacts.	An estimated **646,200 footprint-acres** in most vegetation types would be treated over a 10-year period. However, standard BLM practice entails measures such as pre-action inventory and avoidance that would likely mitigate these impacts.	An estimated **1,686,600 footprint-acres** would be treated over a 10-year period, resulting in a corresponding increase in risk to cultural resources or Native American concerns. However, standard BLM practice entails measures such as pre-action inventory and avoidance that would likely mitigate these impacts.	An estimated **1,522,400 footprint-acres** would be treated over a 10-year period. Impacts would be similar to those described for Alternative C.
Socioeconomics	The loss of revenue to the BLM in the form of grazing fees would be **$65,075** over the next 10-year period. Total fire management costs over the next 10 years would be approximately **$133 million**, of which approximately **$46 million** would be funneled into the local economy.	The loss of revenue to the BLM in the form of grazing fees would be **$168,213** over the next 10-year period. Total fire management costs over the next 10 years would be approximately **$114 million**, of which approximately **40 million** would be funneled into the local economy.	The loss of revenue to the BLM in the form of grazing fees would be **$439,040** over the next 10-year period. Total fire management costs over the next 10 years would be approximately **$199 million**, of which approximately **$70 million** would be funneled into the local economy.	The loss of revenue to the BLM in the form of grazing fees would be **$396,297** over the next 10-year period. Total fire management costs over the next 10 years would be approximately **$184 million**, of which approximately **$64 million** would be funneled into the local economy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER THREE

CHAPTER FOUR

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER ONE

CHAPTER TWO

CHAPTER FOUR

LIST OF APPENDICES

LIST OF MAPS